ADJOURNMENT MOTION.

Re: Delay in Nationalisation of Bangalore Transport Company.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now Adjournment Motion.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have sent an adjournment motion which runs as follows :

> "This House do now adjourn to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance and of recent occurrence to wit: the situation arising out of the failure of the Government in not taking over the Bangalore Transport Company, Ltd., from 1st April 1956 as announced by the Government previously."

The B.T.C. is plying bus service in the City of Bangalore where there is a population of nearly 10 to 11 lakhs. It is not only the citizens of Bangalore City but several people that come to Bangalore, as Bangalore is the seat of Government, make use of this service. Therefore, the public are vitally interested in the transport service. The Finance Minister and the Chief Minister in his Budget speech categorically stated that the Bangalore Transport Company would be taken over by Government from 1st April 1956. During the question hour also, Government have made this statement. Since Government have not taken over the Transport Company on 1st April 1956, they have failed in their duty in not fulfilling their announcement. This is, therefore, a definite matter; it occurred on 1st April 1956 and so it is of recent occurrence. In view of this, I urge that this adjournment motion should be allowed.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Home Minister).—Sir, I submit, it is not a subject matter for adjournment motion because the question of nationalisation of the B.T.C. is before this House for the last two years. It is true that the Chief Minister made a statement in his Budget speech that the B.T.C. would be nationalised on 1st April 1956, depending on certain calculations that we made. Afterwards, Sir, a Bill was got ready. Hon'ble Members are aware that a provision was also made in the Budget.

Unfortunately I suddenly fell ill. I could not introduce the Bill well in time and further there was also one other reason. We thought as soon as the question of the K.G.F. nationalisation Bill was finalised, perhaps it might be much better we took it up and afterwards it was found impossible to take over the B.T.C. on 1st April 1956. Therefore the Government requested B.T.C. to continue for some time more till the question of nationalisation was finalised. Since a Bill has to be introduced, we have not had recourse to any ordinance so far and I do not want to do it. The Chief Minister has announced that we are likely to meet in the month of June. In that session I am sure the Bill will be passed. Everything is ready, the set up and all these things are ready. Therefore it has become inevitable under the circumstances to postpone it for some time. But the public have never been inconvenienced so far. It is going on. Therefore for some of the reasons beyond my control I was not able to get the assent of this House in time. I assure you that no delay will be caused in getting it nationalised as early as possible. With this assurance, I am sure the Hon'ble Member will not press his motion.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—I agree with Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy that this is a very important subject-matter. Two days ago I pointed out the danger of the delay in taking a decision regarding nationalisation. True the postponement of nationalisation may not cause inconvenience to the passengers, but it is attended with many a risk to the Government. When we once make up our mind, we must do at once or there may be loss to the Government. Now the Home Minister has pleaded that it is not possible, in the near future, to legislate; but he can have recourse to ordinance. When the Government of India wanted to nationalise the insurance companies, they had recourse to ordinance and

(SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM.)

afterwards sought the approval of the Parliament. Similarly, the Government of Mysore can do the same thing.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You are speaking on the merits of the case.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Not on the merits. He should have considered the question of nationalisation and taken over the concern. Otherwise, if he delays, it may mean a good deal of loss to Government and so many things may happen in the concern. When once they make up their mind, they must do at once.

Sri K. S. VASAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—I want a clarification on this. Would the Hon'ble Minister kindly tell us if it is not true that the B.T.C. is already busy disposing of, by selling, a lot of their property?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Not at all. I assure you that not a pin will be sold without the express orders of the Government and what is more, ಹಾಗೆ ಅವರು ಯಾವುದನ್ನೂ ಮಾರಾಟ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾರೋ ಜನರು ಆ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಆ ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡು ಆ ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ನಂಬಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. And I have issued instructions. Nothing has been sold and I may tell you they are not interested in carrying it off and if it is the will of this House that we have to do it by ordinance, we may do it, but generally Government are reluctant to use the ordinance power unless it is absolutely essential.

Sri M. RAJASEKHARA MURTHY (Yelandur).—The Hon'ble Minister made a reference to the introduction of the Bill for the nationalisation of the B. T. C. The Government of India have proposed series of amendments to the Indian Motor Vehicles Act relating to nationalisation. According to this amendment, any State Government may take up any route after a Gazette notification. There is also an amendment relating to the computation of compensation. This amendment Bill is introduced in the Parliament and is going to be enacted into law shortly. In view of this amending Bill, there is no need for the State Government to introduce a Bill in the State Legislature. I hope the Minister will clarify the point to the House.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—What that draft Bill contains has also been taken note of by me when drafting this Bill and, as a matter of fact, that Bill is still before the Parliament and it has not been enacted as a law as yet. We will examine it and if there is any need, then the question of ordinance will also be examined.

(*Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy rose.*)

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Leader of the House).—There is a definite procedure laid down. I am not happy to make this observation. The mover of the motion explains and the Government replies. It has again turned into a general debate. I leave it at that.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Hon'ble Members are aware that one of the conditions pre-requisite for admission of an adjournment motion is that it should be urgent, that is, that the situation is such that debate thereon brooks no delay. I am of the view that the subject is not of such urgency as to require it to be taken up in supersession of the appointed business. Therefore, I hold that the motion is not admissible.

STATES REORGANISATION BILL, 1956.

Motion to consider—(contd.).

Sri M. LINGANNA (Nanjangud).—The Draft Bill of the States Reorganisation is being considered by this House since two days and I wholeheartedly welcome it. And some members of course advanced arguments in support of the Bill and in the end they came to the conclusion that further expansion is a necessity and also it is in the interests of the whole of India. Before I speak a few words about that aspect of the question, one matter that probably has engaged the mind of this House and also the members who are expected to be with us just after the appointed day is about the name of the future State that is envisaged under clause 7 of the Draft Bill. It is definitely said in that Bill that the new State is to be named as the State of Mysore.